90-613

APPENDIX

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 13 1990
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In The Supreme Court
of the
United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1990

No.

BLACK CRYSTAL COMPANY, INC.,
Petitioner

V

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF
LOUISVILLE
Respondent

APPENDIX TO THE
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
To the United States Court of Appeals
For the Sixth Circuit

JAMES K. O'GALLAGHER
55 NEW MONTGOMERY STREET, # 306
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105
(415) 243-0573
ATTORNEY FOR PETITIONER

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A Opinion of United States Court of Appeals (Sixth Circuit) dated May 1, 1990

B Opinion of United States District Court Western District of KY dated 5/11/89

C ORDER of United States Court of Appeals (6th Circuit) dated June 15, 1990

D-1 Draft from UKB to FNB(Respondent(dtd 7/11/81

D-(2-5) Assignments of Proceeds/Drafts from Black Crystal Company, Inc to Various Assgignees

E Telex dated July 15, 1981 from Taipeibank to FNB(Respondent)

APPENDIX A

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

Notice: NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION
Sixth Circuit Rule 24 limits citation to specific situations. Please see Rule 24 before citing in a proceeding in a court in the Sixth Circuit. If cited a copy must be served on other parties and the Court. This notice is to be p r o m i n e n t l y displayed if this decision is reproduced.

No. 88-5650

F I L E D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY-1 1990

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

LEONARD GREEN

Clerk

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT & CONSULTING, INCORPORATED;
LANDAF SHIPPING LIMITED;
POLYKYN NAVIGATION,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

BLACK CRYSTAL COMPANY, INC.,

Defendant, Third Party-Plaintiff, Appellant,

UNITED KENTUCKY BANK; YOUSSEF ALI HASSANIAN;

Defendants,

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF LOUISVILLE,

Third Party-
Defendant, Appellee.

BEFORE: KENNEDY and RYAN, Circuit Judges; and SMITH, District Judge.*

---

* The Honorable George C. Smith, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, sitting by designation.

RYAN, Circuit Judge. Third-party plaintiff-appellant, Black Crystal Company, Inc. ("Black Crystal"), appeals the district court order granting summary judgment for third-party defendant-appellee First National Bank of Louisville ("First National") in this action involving the issuance and non-payment of a commercial letter of credit ("the Credit").

Because the record reveals no genuine issue of a material fact, the district court correctly granted summary judgment for appellee First National. Thus, we affirm the district court's judgment.

I.

This case involves a commercial letter of credit issued by the City Bank of Taipei. The beneficiary was identified in the letter of credit as "Black Crystal

Company, Inc., Export Division." The Credit also identified United Kentucky Bank as the advising bank. First National was the confirming bank. Although the Credit did not specify a negotiating bank, appellant contends that United Kentucky Bank acted as one. Appellee disputes that contention.

Black Crystal claims that First National was liable for payment under the Credit and that First National wrongfully refused to pay. Appellant raised the following issues on appeal:

1. Whether the Beneficiary did meet the expiration date of July 10, 1981 so as to be in a position to demand payment under the letter of credit.

2. Whether the Beneficiary presented the documents to a bank in a position to accept the documents and accept

responsibility as a negotiating bank.

3. Whether the Beneficiary did fulfill the terms and conditions of the letter of credit.

4. Whether the dishonor of the letter by the bank which had undertaken to confirm, FIRST NATIONAL BANK, was wrongful.

5. Whether the dishonor was entirely the fault of FIRST NATIONAL BANK, or whether other parties, including UNITED KENTUCKY BANK, BANK OF CALIFORNIA INTERNATIONAL etc. shared some responsibility.

6. What was the effect of "Amendment 9", i.e. was it a true amendment?

7. Was "Amendment 9" wrongful in itself, and the result of negligence or deliberate interference with the transaction?

8. Given the conflicts of the testimony and interpretations of factual developments in the case, was summary judgment a proper remedy?

II.

A court deciding a motion for summary judgment must consider "whether the evidence presents a sufficient disagreement to require submission to a jury or whether it is so one-sided that one party must prevail as a matter of law."
Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 251-52 (1986).

> "[O]n a motion for summary judgment the movant has the burden of showing conclusively that there exists no genuine issue as to a material fact and the evidence together with all inferences to be drawn therefrom must be read in the light most favorable to

the party opposing the motion." Blakeman v. Mead Containers, 779 F.2d 1146, 1150 (6th Cir. 1985), quoting Smith v. Hudson, 600 F.2d 60, 63 (6th Cir.), cert. dismissed, 444 U.S. 986 (1979).

Appellant argues that summary judgment was inappropriate in this case because "the facts are immensely in dispute." Appellant claims that it timely submitted the documents required by the Credit to United Kentucky Bank, a bank claimed by appellant to be a negotiating bank. The record does not support appellant's claims.

After carefully examining the record, we conclude that summary judgment for appellee was appropriate because there is no genuine issue as to the material fact.

Finally, appellant argues that the District Court erred in failing to consi-

der the application of appellant's waiver and estoppel theories. Appellant contends that because the United Kentucky Bank did not notify Black Crystal of any problems when the documents were presented to and accepted by Hassanian on July 10, the fact that First National refused to accept them after the expiry date can have no effect on Black Crystal's right to payment. However, appellant's argument assumes that United Kentucky Bank acted as a negotiator of the letter of credit when in fact it did not. The undisputed testimony of the Kentucky Bank's officer, who was responsible for dealing with Black Crystal's affairs, was that at no time did United Kentucky Bank negotiate the letter of credit.

For the reasons fully detailed by the district court in its well-written opinion which we fully adopt as though it were our own, we AFFIRM.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE DIVISION

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT
& CONSULTING, INC., et al.,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

CIVIL ACTION
No.
82-350L(J)

BLACK CRYSTAL CO., INC.
et al.,

DEFENDANTS.

ORDER OF SUMMARY JUDGMENT

In accordance with the Memorandum Opinion this date entered, First National Bank of Louisville's Motion for Summary Judgment IS GRANTED. Black Crystal's Motion for Summary Judgment IS DENIED and its claims against First National Bank of Louisville are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE.

All other claims in this action have been resolved previously. The clerk shall STRIKE THIS ACTION FROM THE DOCKET.

This is a final and appealable order.

DATED 5-11-88

SIGNED

Edward H Johnstone, Chief Judge

United States District Court

E N T E R E D

MAY 10 1988

JESSE W CRIDER,CLERK
BY (SIGNED)
DEPUTY CLERK

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE DIVISION

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT & CONSULTING, INC., et al.,

PLAINTIFFS,

v. (CIVIL ACTION (No.82-350L(J)

BLACK CRYSTAL CO., INC. et al.,

DEFENDANTS.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This case presents the court with a veritable Augean stable of questions concerning the issuance and payment of a letter of credit issued as part of a contract between Black Crystal Coal Company of San Francisco, California (hereinafter Black Crystal) and Lucky Cement Corporation, of Taiwan (hereinafter Lucky Cement). Before the court are First National Bank of Louisville's Motion for Summary Judgment on Black Crystal's Third Party Complaint and Black Crystal's Motion for Summary Judgment on its Third Party Complaint. Jurisdiction is proper under 28 U.S.C. 1332.

I.FACTS

On or about January 30, 1981, Lucky Cement Corporation of Taipei, Taiwan contracted with Black Crystal Coal Company

for the purchase and sale of more than 126,000 metric tons of steaming coal. The coal was to be shipped in five shipments of from 25,000 to 26,400 metric tons from the United States to Taiwan. As part of their agreement, Lucky Cement had an irrevocable, negotiable letter of credit (hereinafter referred to as the Credit) in the amount of $1,784,640.00 issued for the benefit of Black Crystal by the City Bank of Taipei (hereinafter Taipeibank).

On or about February 18, 1981 the Credit was sent by tested telex to First National Bank of Louisville in Louisville, Kentucky (hereinafter First National). The Credit expressly designated the Bank of California International as the reimbursing bank and the United Kentucky Bank (hereinafter UKB) as an advising bank, but did not designate a negotiating bank. The final shipping date set forth was

March 9, 1981 and the expiration date was March 29, 1981. The Credit provided for payment of drafts if accompanied by certain commercial invoices, Ocean Bills of Lading, an Order of the City Bank of Taipei, a Certificate of Origin, a Certificate of Inspection Analysis and Weight, a Certificate from the beneficiary, and an Original Suppliers Certificate. As a final matter, the telex stated that it was "subject to" the Uniform Customs and Practices for Documentary Credits, International Chamber of Commerce Publication 290 (hereinafter abbreviated UCP). [1].

---

[1] The Credit telex provided as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF LOUISVILLE

LOUISVILLE,KENTUCKY USA

TEST:_____

PLS ADVISE THRU UNITED KENTUCKY BANK LOUISVILLE

WE OPEN IRREVOCABLE CREDIT OTH2/00792

/UO

BENEFICIARY BLACK CRYSTAL COMPANY

INC.EXPORT DIV

1144 CLAY STREET

SAN FRANCISCO CALIF 94100 USA

ACCOUNTEE LUCKY CEMENT CORP 8TH FL

95 SHIN LIN FU-KUO RD

TAIPEI TAIWAN REPUBLIC OF CHINA

AMOUNT USDLS$1,784,640.00

COVERING 26,400 MT AMERICAN STEAMING

COAL IN BULK AT SELLER'S

OPTION,AT USDLS67.60 PER METRIC TON

CANDF SUAO FREE OUT

LATEST SHIPPING MAR 19 1981 EXPIRY

MAR 29 1981

SHIPMENT FROM NEW ORLEANS TO SUAO

PARTIAL SHIPMENTS ALLOWED TRANSHIP-

MENT PROHIBITED

AVAILABLE AGAINST BENEFICIARY'S

DRAFT(S)DRAWN ON US AT 180DAYS

AFTER SIGHT FOR FULL INVOICE COST

ACCOMPANIED BY THE FOLLOWING DOCTS:

SIGNED COMMERCIAL INVOICE IN QUIN-

TUPLICATE INDICATING IMPORT PERMIT

NO.69RCI-008859B

FULL SET OF CLEAN ON BOARD OCEAN

BILLS OF LADING MADE OUT TO

THE ORDER OF CITY BANK OF TAIPEI-

TAIPEI MARKED FREIGHT PREPAID

NOTIFY BUYER

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGIN IN TRIPLICATE

ISSUED BY GOVERNMENTAL AUTHORITY

THE CERTIFICATE OF INSPECTION

ANALYSIS AND WEIGHT IN QUINTUPLICATE

ISSUED BY COMMERCIAL TESTING CO

BENEFICIARY'S CERTIFICATE STATING

THAT DUPLICATE SET OF THE ABOVE DOCU-

MENTS HAS BEEN AIRMAILED BY REGISTE-

RED EXPRESS MAIL

DIRECTLY TO THE BUYER BY BENEFICIARY

WITHIN 3 DAYS AFTER THE SHIPMENT IS

EFFECTED

ONE ORIGINAL SUPPLIERS CERTIFICATE

(BLANK FORM AIRMAILING)

ALL BANKING CHARGES OUTSIDE TAIWAN

ARE FOR A/C BENEFICIARY

THE USANCE DRAFT(S)DRAWN HEREUNDER

ARE NEGOTIABLE ON A SIGHT BASIS WITH

DISCOUNT CHARGES AND ACCEPTANCE

COMMISSIONS FOR

BUYER'S A/C

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS:

1)CHARTER PARTY D/L IS ACCEPTABLE

2)T/T REIMBURSEMENT CERTIFYING

COMPLIANCE IS ACCEPTABLE

3)WITHIN 10DAYS AFTER RECEIPT OF THIS

L/C ADVICE,BENEFICIARY MUST ESTABLISH

A LETTER OF GUARANTEE OR STAND-BY L/C

FOR USDLS 53,460.00 VIA ADVISING BANK

AS PERFORMANCE BOND TO CITY BANK OF

TAIPEI TAIPEI THIS L/C OR L/G SHALL

BE RELEASED WITHOUT INTEREST AFTER

THE CONTRACTED COMMODITY HAS ARRIVED IN TAIWAN AND HAS BEEN FOUND TO BE IN ACCEPTABLE CONDITION AND SELLER'S PAYMENT MADE TO THE BUYER OF DESPATCH MONEY AND PENALTY WHICH WILL BE NOTICED BY BUYER THROUGH THE ISSUING BANK

TO THE NEGOTIATING BANK ONLY:UPON NEGOTIATION OF THE DRAFT DRAWN UNDER THIS CREDIT PLS CABLE US OF THE AMOUNT NEGOTIATED FOR REIMBURSEMENT, PLS DRAW AT SIGHT ON THE BANK OF CALIF INTL NEW YORK FOR THE FACE AMOUNT OF THE DRAFT UPON NEGOTIATION CERTIFYING IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CREDIT TERMS AND CONDITIONS ALL DOCUMENTS ARE TO BE DESPATCHED IN TWO SETS BY CONSECUTIVE AIRMAILS TO THE ISSUING BANK WE UNDERTAKE THAT DRAFTS DRAWN AND PRESENTED IN CONFORMITY WITH THE

TERMS OF THIS CREDIT WILL BE DULY HONORED SUBJECT TO UCP FOR DOCUMENTARY CREDIT (1974 REVISION) INTL CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BROCHURE NO 290

TAIPEIBANK

After the Credit was opened, Black Crystal used it to finance the mining, trucking, testing and transportation of the coal called for in the Lucky Cement /Black Crystal contract by assigning rights to proceeds from the Credit to the various mining, trucking and barging companies involved. Despite Black Crystal's efforts and arrangements however, it was unable to meet the March 1981 contract dates. Accordingly, Black Crystal requested and received four extensions of its performance dates and four corresponding extensions of the Credit's shipping and expiration dates in Amendments 6, 7, 8, and 10 to the Credit. Under the terms of

Amendment 10, the shipping date was extended to June 30, 1981 and the Credit's expiration date was extended to July 10, 1981.

At some point, Black Crystal found it desirable or necessary to have its Credit confirmed by another bank. To this end, on May 25, 1981, Black Crystal sent a telex to First National asking First National to notify Taipeibank that Black Crystal wanted the Credit confirmed. First National sent a telex on behalf of Black Crystal to Taipeibank reciting Black Crystal's request. Two days later, on May 27, 1981, First National, on its behalf, sent another telex to Taipeibank requesting authorization to confirm. The First National telex stated in part

> Please authorize us by tested telex to confirm this letter of credit. Also please amend L/C to read 'avai-

lable against beneficiary's draft(s) drawn on First National Bank of Louisville, Kentucky at 180 days after sight for full invoice cost."

On May 28, 1981 Taipeibank, by telex, agreed to a confirmation of the Credit and authorized First National to confirm, but stated that "all other terms and conditions remain unchanged."

On May 29, 1981, First National confirmed the Credit in Amendment 9. In that Amendment First National stated:

> We confirm this Credit and thereby undertake that all drafts drawn and presented to First National Bank of Louisville by United Kentucky Bank, International Dept., P.O.Box 34000, Louisville, Kentucky 40232, on behalf of the beneficiary of this Credit in conformity with the terms of this Credit will be duly honored

by First National of Louisville if all terms and conditions of this Credit have been met and as soon as First National Bank of Louisville has been reimbursed by the Bank of California International, New York for face amount of the draft in available funds. First National Bank of Louisville will then paid (sic.) in available funds to United Kentucky Bank the amount of any drawing less First National Bank of Louisville's fee for United Kentucky Bank to disburse proceeds to the beneficiary and/or their assignees if any.

This amendment was signed by representatives of UKB and Black Crystal.

The same day that First National confirmed the Credit, the first shipment of coal mined for the Black Crystal/Lucky Cement contract was beginning to be loaded

on river barges at the Lyon County Coal Terminal in Kentucky. All did not go smoothly. There was some dispute with the Lyon County Coal Terminal concerning payment of terminal charges and loading was delayed. On June 10, after approximately 6 barges had been loaded, Black Crystal transferred loading operations to Reid Quarry, where the remainder of the coal was loaded on 10 more barges and all 16 were sent downstream to New Orleans, Louisiana. The 16 barges of coal arrived in New Orleans for mid-stream stevedoring and loading to vessel around June 23, 1981.

At some point prior to the coal's arrival in New Orleans, Black Crystal entered negotiations with Cerbere & Co., Ltd. (hereinafter Cerbere) for ocean transportation of the coal to Suao, Taiwan on board the ship EASTERN HORNET.

Cerbere agreed to ship the coal and to accept an assignment of proceeds for ocean freight charges, provided a proper key tested telex was sent from a confirming bank to Cerbere's bank, Banco Urquijo, authenticating Black Crystal's Credit. Apparently Black Crystal asked First National to send an authenticating telex to Banco Urquijo, but no such telex was sent. Thereafter, in late June, 1981, Cerbere threatened to cancel its arrangement with Black Crystal because no telex had been sent to Banco Urquijo. Cerbere gave Black Crystal until June 29, 1981 to send a telex.

On June 29, 1981, First National contacted Cerbere concerning Black Crystal's credit. Evidently there was some difficulty, misunderstanding or disagreement between Cerbere and First National because First National apparently never

sent the requested telex to Banco Urquijo. Black Crystal alleges that as a direct consequence to First National's actions, charter party negotiations between Black Crystal and Cerbere ended on June 29, 1981. After the break up of negotiations with Cerbere, Black Crystal arranged transportation of the coal by spot chartering the ship SAN NICHOLAS from Anteres Shipping and Trading Corporation. The Charter Party agreement for the transportation of the coal aboard the SAN NICHOLAS was signed in San Francisco on June 30, 1981.

On July 9 and 19, 1981, the coal was loaded aboard the SAN NICHOLAS. Youseff Ali Hassanian (Hassanian), an officer of UKB from Louisville, Kentucky, was in New Orleans to observe the loading and to receive the bills of lading and other documents relating to the coal. After

the coal was loaded on board the SAN NICHOLAS, Hassanian took the bills of lading and other documents and returned to Louisville. He testified at a deposition that when he returned to Louisville from New Orleans, he had all the documents that were required to be used in the negotiation of the Credit.

Black Crystal claims that thereafter, on July 12 and 13, 1981, Hassanian prepared and mailed two sets of the documents required by the Credit to Taipeibank and First National. In these mailings Hassanian allegedly certified that he had all the documents in satisfaction of the Credit's terms and conditions and requested payment be wired to UKB. First National disputes this, and claims that neither the documents required by the Credit nor a draft drawn on the Credit was ever actually presented to First National for pay-

ment. In any case, on July 13, 1981, a First National representative told Hassanian that no extension to the Credit's expiration date had been received and that the Credit had expired on July 10. First National refused to honor UKB's draft and never paid any draft drawn on the Credit.

On July 17,1981 the Bank of California received a telex from Taipeibank instructing the Bank of California not to pay any reimbursement requested under the Credit. The telex went on to state that payment should be made "only at receipt of our further instructions." On July 20, 1981 the Bank of California received another telex from Taipeibank requesting that the Bank of California confirm receipt of the July 17 message and asking the Bank of California whether it had paid under the Credit. The Bank of

California responded by telex that it had not received a reimbursement claim to that time and that it would inform Taipei bank upon receiving a demand and before paying.

On July 27, 1981 representatives of UKB and Black Crystal visited the New York office of the Bank of California and delivered documents intended to be in satisfaction of the terms and conditions of the Credit. The Bank of California examined the documents, found discrepan-cies, and refused to pay. A Black Crystal representative returned to the Bank of California's offices on July 28, 1981 with proposed amendments, but the Bank of California still refused to pay. The Bank of California sent a telex to UKB on July 29, 1981 enumerating the discrepancies in the documents and calling attention to the instructions from Taipeibank not to pay.

The Bank of California was never authorized to and never made any payment under the Credit.

Meanwhile, the coal which was loaded on board the SAN NICHOLAS in New Orleans had been transported across the ocean to a point off the coast of Taiwan. Once there however, the coal was not unloaded. Allegedly the ocean shippers refused to unload the coal until they were paid. Since payment was not forthcoming, they apparently disposed of the coal at a port in Korea.

In 1982 the inland and oceangoing shippers of the coal instituted this suit against Black Crystal and UKB. Black Crystal filed a Third Party Complaint against First National.

II. NATURE OF THE TRANSACTION

The court must begin analysis of this matter by noting some uncertainty about

the legal nature of the transactions and relationships at issue here. Some authorities view letters of credit arrangements as something separate from the traditional contract. See, e.g., Voest-Alpine Intern. Corp. v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 707 F.2d 680,682-83 (2dCir. 1983); Bank of Cochin Ltd. v. Manufacturers Hanover Trust, 612 F.Supp.1533,1537 (S.D.N.Y.1985), aff'd, 808 F.2d 209 (2d Cir. 1986); J. WHITE AND R. SUMMERS, UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE 5.53 at 103 (1977). Other authorities have viewed letters of credit as executory unilateral contracts, to which general contract principles are applicable. See, e.g., Union Planters National Bank v. World Energy Systems, 816 F.2d 1092, 1098 (6th Cic. 1987); Bank of North Carolina, N.N. v. Rock Island Bank, 570 F.2d 202, 207 (7th Cir. 1978); Venizelos, S.A. v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 425 F.2d 461,465-66

(2d Cir. 1970); Transparent Products v. Paysaver Credit Union, 198 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 605 (N.D. Ill., Jan 21, 1988); Worldwide Sugar Co. v. Royal Bank of Canada, 609 F.Supp. 19,23-24 (S.D.N.Y. 1984); Consolidated Aluminum Corp. v. Bank of Virginia, 544 F.Supp. 386,395 (D.Md. 1982), aff'd, 704 F.2d 136 (2d Cir. 1983).

Regardless of the legal description of the parties' relationships in this case, this court is bound to apply the terms of the letter of credit as it was agreed to by the parties. Consequently, the court must refrain from injecting its own views into the parties' agreements or from remaking the agreements which they have freely entered. With these general principles in mind the court will consider the rights and obligations of the parties under the Credit, under First

National's confirmation of the Credit, under Article 41 of the UCP, and under UKB's negotiation of the Credit.

III. RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE CREDIT

The Credit in this case was issued on or about February 18, 1981 by Taipeibank on behalf of its customer, Lucky Cement. The Credit expressly stated that it was "subject to" the UCP. Black Crystal argues that this provision precludes the application of Article 5 of the Uniform Commercial Code [2] (hereinafter the UCC) to the parties' relationship. First National disagrees. Because there is little or no substantive difference between the rights and obligations imposed

---

[2] Article 5 of the Uniform Commercial Code is enacted in Kentucky as KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-101 et seq.

imposed by the UCC and the UCP to the relationships considered here, the court need not choose between the UCC and the UCP to resolve this matter.

A letter of credit is purely a transaction in documents. See Banco Nacional de Desarrollo v. Mellon Bank, N.A., 726 F.2d 87,91 (3d Cir. 1984); Chase Manhattan Bank v. Equibank, 550 F.2d 882,885 (3d Cir. 1977); Courtaulds North America, Inc. v. North Carolina National Bank, 528 F.2d 802,805-6 (4th Cir. 1975); UCP Art. 8(a). In the typical letter of credit transaction an issuing bank draws a letter of credit in favor of a beneficiary for the payment of money upon presentation of certain documents prepared for the issuing bank's customer pursuant to a contract between the customer and the beneficiary. See KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-103(1)(a); UCP General Provisions

and Definitions b. In essence therefore, a letter of credit is an engagement by the issuing bank for the purchase of the documents specified in the letter of credit. See Equibank, supra at 885.

In such an arrangement the issuing bank has the obligation to pay o n l y upon a presentation made in accord with the terms of the letter of credit. See Union Planters National Bank v. World Energy Systems, 816 F.2d 1092,1098 (6th Cir. 1987); KY. REV. STAT. 355.5-114(1); UCP Art. 3(a). Upon proper presentation, the beneficiary has the right to collect payment from the issuing bank and the issuing bank has the corresponding right to collect from its customer any sums paid under the credit. See KY. REV. STAT. 355.5-114(3). Before the issuing bank may pay or the beneficiary collect, the issuing bank has the duty to ensure that the

presentation strictly conforms to the terms of the letter of credit. [3]. See KY.REV.STAT.355.5-109(2); UCP Art. 7. In the absence of strict conformity, the bene-ficiary cannot force payment and the

---

[3] Whether a letter of credit beneficiary is held to a standard of strict compliance is a matter of local law. Tosco Corp. v. FDIC, 723 F.2d 1241 (6th Cir. 1983). Nothing in the UCC or the UCP indicates that the strict compliance rule should not be followed in letters of credit "subject to" the UCP.

Although there is no Kentucky case law on this point, Kentucky would probably follow the majority rule requiring strict compliance with the terms of a letter of credit. Cf.UTICA Mut.Ins. Co. v. Walker, 725 S.W.2d 24,26 (Ky.Ct.App,1987) (applying New York law).

bank pays at its peril. See Equibank, supra at 886. In the case of the documents required by the letter of credit, this means the issuing bank has the right to examine them to "ascertain that on their face they appear to comply with the terms of the credit". KY. REV. STAT. 355.5-109(2); accord UCP Arts. 7 and 8. If the documents do not strictly comply with the terms and conditions contained in the letter of credit, an issuing bank is not required to pay the draft presented. See Board of Trade of San Francisco v. Swiss Credit Bank, 728 F.2d 1241,1243 (9th Cir. 1984); Banco Nacional de Desarrollo v. Mellon Bank, N.A., 726 F.2d 87, 91 (3d Cir. 1984); Voest-Alpine Intern. Corp. v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 707 F.2d 680, 682-83 (2d Cir. 1983); Courtaulds North America, Inc. v. North Carolina National Bank, 528 F.2d 802,

805-06 (4th Cir. 1975); Venizelos, S.A. v. Chase Manhattan Bank, 425 F.2d 461, 464-65 (2d Cir. 1970).

The issuing bank also has the right to insist that a beneficiary strictly comply with any time restrictions in the letter of credit. The time restrictions placed upon the beneficiary are perhaps the most important and material requirements affecting the parties' rights since they fix with certainty the liability of the issuing bank. See Consolidated Aluminum Corp. v. Bank of Virginia, 544 F.Supp.386,397 (D.Md. 1982), aff'd, 704 F.2d 136 (2d Cir. 1983); Bank of America National Trust and Savings Ass'n v. Liberty National Bank and Trust Co., 218 F.2d 831, 840-41 (10th Cir. 1955) ("[W]here a date is fixed in a letter of credit for its expiration, such provision becomes an important condition, and there

must be strict compliance with it before there can be liability on the part of a bank issuing the letter."). See also Cypress Bank v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co., 610 S.W.2d 185,187 (Tex. Civ. App. 1980). Consequently the issuing bank has the right to insists that the beneficiary of a letter of credit present the required documents prior to the expiration of the letter of credit or demonstrate that he could have presented them in a timely fashion but was unjustifiably prevented from doing so. See Consolidated Aluminum, supra at 391-92; North American Foreign Trading Corp. v. General Electronics Ltd., 413 N.Y.S.2d 700, 26 U.C.C.R.S. 168, 171 (N.Y. App. Div.1979); see also KY. REV. STAT. 355.3-511; UCP Arts. 11 and 39. If the documents are not presented on time, the issuing bank's obligations end at the expiration date and

the issuing bank need not pay a draft on the letter of credit. See Consolidated Aluminum, supra at 387-98; Hyland Hills Metropolitan Park and Recreational District v. McCoy Enterprises, Inc., 554 P.2d 708, 20 U.C.C.R.S. 488,491 (Colo. Ct. App. 1976).

In this case the Credit was an engagement between Taipeibank (the issuing bank) and Black Crystal (the beneficiary), for the payment of money upon the proper presentation of certain documents (bill of lading, etc.) prepared at the behest of Lucky Cements (Taipeibank's customer) pursuant to the terms of the Lucky Cement /Black Crystal coal contract of January 30, 1981. In its position as issuing bank, Taipeibank had the right and obligation to inspect the documents presented and to require strict adherence to all the Credit's terms, including the expiration date.

IV. RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE CONFIRMATION

On May 29, 1981, pursuant to the request and authorization of Taipeibank, First National "confirmed" Black Crystal's Credit (hereinafter referred to as the Confirmation). In so doing, First National assumed the position of a "confirming bank" under both the UCC and the UCP.

A confirming bank "is a bank which engages either that it will itself honor a credit already issued by another bank or that such credit will be honored by the issuer or a third bank." KY.REV.STAT.355.5-103(1)(f); accord UCP Art. 3(b). Thus, a confirming bank essentially assumes the obligations of an issuing bank as to the Credit confirmed. See KY.REV.STAT.355.5-107(2) and comment; UCP Art. 3(b). [4].

[4] In the present case First National generally assumed the rights and duties of Taipeibank as to the Credit when it confirmed the Credit. Thus, as discussed above, First National had the duty to pay according to the Credit "provided that the terms and conditions of the Credit are complied with." See UCP Art.3(b); KY. REV.STAT.355.5-109. Additionally, First National, like Taipeibank, had the right and duty to examine all documents presented with reasonable care upon presentation to determine that they conformed to the conditions of the Credit. See Seattle - First Nat. Bank v. F.D.I.C.,619 F.SUPP. 1351,1362 (D.C.Ok.1985); KY.REV.STAT.355.5 -109 (2); UCP Art.7. Upon proper presentation and payment of a Credit draft, First National had the right to reimbursement from its customer, Taipeibank. KY. REV. STAT. 355.5-114(3).

However, the obligations that a confirming bank assumes need not exactly mirror the issuing bank's obligations under the letter of credit.

A confirmation is a separate engagement, independent from the letter of credit which it confirms. The obligations created by a confirmation are distinct from the issuing bank's obligations on the letter of credit. Consequently, the terms of a confirmation generally do not affect the obligations running between the issuing bank and the beneficiary - they merely add another, parallel set of obligations into the milieu. See UCP 3(b); KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-107(2), and comment. Both the UCC and the UCP allow parties to restrict these obligations and rights by agreement. See UCP General Provisions (a) [5]; KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-107(2) [6]. Such a restricted

confirmation is not necessarily an amendment of the letter of credit.

In the present case, First National confirmed Taipeibank's Credit in Amendment 9 thereto. The Confirmation contained terms and conditions slightly at variance with the original Credit. Specifically, the Confirmation stated that First National would pay under the Credit only

---

[5] UCP General Principles and Definitions (a) states

> These provisions and definitions in the following articles apply to all documentary credits and are binding upon all parties thereto unless otherwise expressly agreed.

[6] Section 355.5-102(2) provides in pertinent part:

> A confirming bank...becomes directly obligated on the credit to the extent of its confirmation as though it were an issuer. KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-102(2) (emphasis added).

1) on payment of $2,000 of "confirmation fees", 2) on drafts presented by United Kentucky Bank, 3) on drafts in conformity with the terms of the Credit, and 4) upon reimbursement by the Bank of California International. These varying terms did not serve to alter the Credit, but created a separate, parallel obligation on the part of First National to pay, provided that the Confirmation's terms and conditions were met. The Confirmation was assented to by Bryan Perry (Perry), a Black Crystal vice president. Black Crystal now claims that Perry did not understand the Confirmation and that he did not have the authority to agree to the Confirmation on behalf of Black Crystal. See Black Crystal's Reply Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment against First National Bank at 17-19. Although this is a genuine dispute of

fact, it is not material to the resolution of this case.

If Perry were without authority to assent to the Confirmation, the Confirmation was presumably ineffective. If the Confirmation was ineffective, the First National Bank did not "confirm" the Credit within the meaning of the UCC and the UCP and was not obligated to pay according to the Confirmation. Therefore First National had no obligation to honor UKB's presentation of documents and demand for payment, whenever it was made. On the other hand, if Perry did have authority to assent then First National did "confirm" the Credit and was obliged to pay according to the Confirmation's terms. One of those terms was that all the terms and conditions of the Credit had to be met before First National would pay. First National had the right to insist that

this term be strictly complied with. The undisputed facts reveal however, that Black Crystal did not meet all of the terms of the Credit.

The Confirmation set June 30, 1981 as the final date for shipping the coal, and July 10, 1981 as the expiration date of the Credit. Black Crystal admits that the coal was not loaded for ocean shipping until June 9-10, 1981 and was shipped thereafter. Additionally, Black Crystal admits that it presented the documents and draft required by the Credit on or about July 13, 1981, three days after the Credit's expiration. Thus the coal was shipped and the presentment was made after the deadline set for each. Because Black Crystal did not meet either these deadlines, First National was within its rights in refusing to honor UKB's demand for payment.

Black Crystal implicitly argues that it was unjustifiably prevented from meeting the shipping and expiration dates in the Credit as a direct result of First National's failure to send an authenticating telex to Banco Urquijo. The court cannot agree. First National was under no obligation to send or receive telexes for or on behalf of Black Crystal. See KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-107(4); UCP Art. 10. Black Crystal offers no proof that First National ever promised to send such a telex. Therefore, First National was justifiably within its rights in failing or refusing to send such telex. Black Crystal offers no other proof that would justify its failure to meet the Credit dates, such as proof that First National maliciously or in bad faith failed to send the telex. See KY.REV.STAT. 355.5-109(1). In the absence of such evidence, First

National cannot be held liable for the problems between Black Crystal and its shippers which may have caused Black Crystal to miss the Credit deadlines. See KY.RE.STAT. 355.5- 109(1)(b).

V. RIGHTS UNDER UCP ARTICLE 41 AND THE TIME FOR PRESENTATION

Black Crystal alleges that UCP Art. 41 gave Black Crystal 21 days after July 10, 1981 to present documents and a draft. The court cannot agree. Article 41 provides:

> Notwithstanding the requirement of Art. 37 that every credit must stipulate a specified period of time after the date of issuance of the Bills of Lading or other shipping documents during which presentation of documents for payment, acceptance or negotiation must be made. If no such period of time is stipulated, in

> the credit, banks will refuse documents presented to them later than 21 days after the date of issuance of the Bills of Lading or other shipping documents.

U.C.P. Art. 41. Black Crystal bases its arguments on the fact that the Credit does not particularly state a time period after the date of issuance of the bills of lading during which any required documents were to be presented for payment, acceptance or negotiation. While this is true, nothing in Article 41 indicates that the 21 day period extends past the expiration date of a letter of credit. Indeed, the International Chamber of Commerce Banking Commission has determined that Art.41 does not extend the time for presentation beyond the expiration date of a letter of credit. See Decisions of the ICC Banking Commission (1975-1979), Inter-

national Chamber of Commerce Publication No. 371 at 82. [7].

VI. RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UPON NEGOTIATION OF THE CREDIT

Finally, Black Crystal asserts that on July 13, 1981 First National had an absolute obligation to pay Black Crystal's draft. Black Crystal premises this conclusion on the grounds that the Credit was "freely negotiable", meaning that Black Crystal could negotiate a draft on the Credit to any bank Black Crystal

---

[7] The Banking Commission agreed that

> If the credit does not stipulate a period of time, documents will be refused if they are presented later then twenty-one (21) days after the date of the issuance of the shipping documents (or, of course, if the credit expires during such period of twenty-one(21) days, if they are presented after the expiry date of the credit).

selected. See UCP General Provisions and Definitions e. Black Crystal asserts that it selected UKB as the negotiating bank and that UKB's receiving, reviewing and approving all of the documents presented by Black Crystal amounted to negotiation, as a matter of law. Relying on UCP Article 13, Black Crystal then argues that once the documents were negotiated that Black Crystal had fulfilled its contractual obligaions under the Credit. At that point Black Crystal concludes, Black Crystal had the right to payment and First National had the obligation to pay. Under Black Crystal's theory, upon negotiation, First National no longer had the right to inspect the documents presented for discrepancies, nor the right to refuse payment of a Credit draft on the basis of any variance with the terms of the Credit. In Black

Crystal's view, these rights and duties fell to UKB as the negotiating bank. The court cannot agree.

First, the court can find no support for Black Crystal's position in the case law or legal treatises dealing with the UCC or the UCP or the law of documentary credits generally. Second, the court can find no specific support for Black Crystal's position in UCP Article 13. UCP Article 13 provides in pertinent part:

> A...negotiating bank which has been authorized to claim reimbursement from a third bank nominated by the issuing bank and which has effected such...negotiation shall not be required to confirm to the third bank that it has done so in accordance with the terms and conditions of the credit.

UCP Art. 13. The apparent purpose behind UCP Article 13 was to take a "reimbursing bank" out of conflicts between the negotiating bank and the issuing bank over proper payment of a letter of credit. According to the ICC Banking Commission, such matters are "of concern only to the issuing bank and the negotiating bank". See Decisions of the ICC Banking Commission (1975-79), International Chamber of Commerce Publication No. 731 at 32-3.

In the Credit in this case, the only "third bank nominated by the issuing bank" as a "reimbursing bank" was the Bank of California. First National was not designated a reimbursing bank in the Credit, and never acted as such as to the Credit. Consequently, Art. 13 does not by its terms apply to First National's position in this case. First National,

as discussed above, was a confirming bank, and under its Confirmation it had the obligation to pay only upon presentation of a draft by UKB which was in conformity with the Credit. Moreover, First National had not only the right, but the duty to its customer, Taipeibank, to inspect the documents before payment and to insist upon strict compliance with the terms of the Credit, including adherence to the stated shipping and expiration dates. Neither Article 13 nor negotiation of the Credit absolved First National of these rights.

For the foregoing reasons, the court concludes that First National properly refused to pay any draft presented by UKB or Black Crystal on the Credit which expired on July 10, 1981.

An appropriate Order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

DATED 5 - 11 - 88

SIGNED

Edward H. Johnstone, Chief Judge

United States District Court

[entered May 16 1988]

JESSE W GRIDER CLERK

by signed

DEPUTY CLEK

APPENDIX C

No. 88-5650

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
JUN 15 1990
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT & CONSULTING, INC., Plaintiffs v. BLACK CRYSTAL COMPANY, INC., Defendant - 3rd Party Plaintiff Appellant	) O R D E R
UNITED KENTUCKY BANK; YOUSSEF ALI HASSANAIN, Defendants	)
FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF LOUISVILLE, Third Party - Defendant-Appellee	)

BEFORE: KENNEDY and RYAN, Circuit Judges; and SMITH*, United States District Judge.

The Court having received a petition for rehearing en banc, and the petition

having been circulated not only to the original panel members but also to all other active judges of this Court, and no judge of this Court having requested a vote on the suggestion for rehearing en banc, the petition for rehearing has been referred to the original hearing panel.

The panel has further reviewed the petition for rehearing and concludes that the issues raised in the petition were fully considered upon the original submission and decision of the case.

Accordingly, the petition is denied.

ENTERED BY THE ORDER OF THE COURT

Leonard Green, Clerk

---

*Hon. George C. Smith sitting by designation from the Southern District of Ohio

APPENDIX D-1

UNITED
KENTUCKY
(logo) BANK

No. _____

At sight

LOUISVILLE, KY
July 11, 1981

Pay to the order of
UNITED KENTUCKY BANK, INC $ 1,507,683.21
One Million, Five Hundred Thousand, Six Hundred, Eighty Three and 21/100 DOLLARS

Attached

Surrender Attached Securities or Documents Only on Payment of Draft

Value Received and Charge to Account of

To First National Bank of Louisville
First National Towers
Louisville, Kentucky, 40202

s/Youssef Hassanain

APPENDIX D-2

ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDS

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That The Black Crystal Company, Inc. Assignor, A Corporation, existing under the laws of Kentucky, for value received does hereby assign, set over and transfer to Bryan Perry, Assignee at 5402 Dahi Road, Louisville Kentucky 40213 all rights, title and interest to all monies due, or to become due, under Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/UO, issued by City Bank of Taipei, Taiwan dated 2/18/81 issued to The Black Crystal Company, Inc., for the account of Lucky Cement Corporation, Taipei,Taiwan, in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Forty and 00/100 U.S.D., of which the balance of $1,758,240.00 remains.

That the amount being assigned herewith is the amount of each draft drawn under the aforementioned Credit up to the aggregate sum of $26,400.00. The Assignee shall not be held responsible for the performance of any work or for the manufacture or delivery of any of the items mentioned in the said Letter of Credit. The Assignor warrants that they have not and will not, by negotiation of drafts or other wise, assign the right to receive the whole or any part of such proceeds or give any other

authorization or direction to make any payment thereof to any third party.

(1) s/NORMAN SYLVESTER FEISTER

(2)(Assignor) s/Bryan Perry

(1) Norman Fiester, Chairman of the Board &

By: President of Black Crystal Company,Inc.

(Authorized Signatory and Title)

(2) Bryan Perry, Executive Vice President

The Black Crystal Company, Inc.

The signatures of Norman Fiester/Bryan Perry with title as stated conforms with that on file with us and is authorized for the execution of such documents.

This signature is subject to the addendum on assignment of proceeds as follows on the back page.

s/Don Reynolds
United Kentucky Bank, Inc.
(Bank)

By: s/Don Reynolds
Authorized Signature

- - - -

said Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/U0
direct to The Black Crystal Company, Inc.
_____.

Dated this 20th day of February, 1981.

United Kentucky Bank, Inc
(Bank)

s/Don Reynolds
(Authorized Signature)

APPENDIX D-3

ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDS

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That The Black Crystal Company, Inc. Assignor, A Corporation, existing under the laws of Kentucky, for value received does hereby assign, set over and transfer to Keiko Sano Feister's acct. No. 04 114442 0153, Assignee at First California Bank,1675 Post St, S.F.Cal.all rights, title and interest to all monies due, or to become due, under Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/UO, issued by City Bank of Taipei, Taiwan dated 2/18/81 issued to The Black Crystal Company, Inc., for the account of Lucky Cement Corporation, Taipei,Taiwan, in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Forty and 00/100 U.S.D., of which the balance of $1,758,240.00 remains.

That the amount being assigned herewith is the amount of each draft drawn under the aforementioned Credit up to the aggregate sum of $26,400.00. The Assignee shall not be held responsible for the performance of any work or for the manufacture or delivery of any of the items mentioned in the said Letter of Credit. The Assignor warrants that they have not and will not, by negotiation of drafts or other wise, assign the right to receive the whole or any part of such proceeds or give any other

authorization or direction to make any payment thereof to any third party.

(1) s/Norman Sylvester Feister

(2)(Assignor) s/Bryan Perry

(1) Norman Fiester, Chairman of the Board &

By: President of Black Crystal Company,Inc.

(Authorized Signatory and Title)

(2) Bryan Perry, Executive Vice President

The Black Crystal Company, Inc.

The signatures of Norman Fiester/Bryan Perry with title as stated conforms with that on file with us and is authorized for the execution of such documents.

This signature is subject to the addendum on assignment of proceeds as follows on the back page.

s/Don Reynolds
united Kentucky Bank, Inc.
(Bank)

By: s/Don Reynolds
Authorized Signature

We have read the above and foregoing assignment and consent to the terms thereof and agree to make the payments sue, and to become due, on account of

said Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/U0
direct to The Black Crystal Company, Inc.
_____.

Dated this 20th day of February, 1981.

United Kentucky Bank, Inc
(Bank)

s/Don Reynolds
(Authorized Signature)

APPENDIX D-4

ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDS

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That The Black Crystal Company, Inc. Assignor, A Corporation, existing under the laws of Kentucky, for value received does hereby assign, set over and transfer to Greater Egyptian Energy Co., Assignee at Golconda Illinois all rights, title and interest to all monies due, or to become due, under Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/UO, issued by City Bank of Taipei, Taiwan dated 2/18/81 issued to The Black Crystal Company, Inc., for the account of Lucky Cement Corporation, Taipei,Taiwan, in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Forty and 00/100 U.S.D., of which the balance of $1440,640.00 remains.

That the amount being assigned herewith is the amount of each draft drawn under the aforementioned Credit up to the aggregate sum of $344,000.00. The Assignee shall not be held responsible for the performance of any work or for the manufacture or delivery of any of the items mentioned in the said Letter of Credit. The Assignor warrants that they have not and will not, by negotiation of drafts or other wise, assign the right to receive the whole or any part of such proceeds or give any other

authorization or direction to make any payment thereof to any third party.

s/Bryan Perry, s/Norman S. Feister
(Assignor)
Bryan Perry, Executive Vice President of
The Black Crystal Company, Inc.

By: s/Norman S. Feister
(Authorized Signatory and Title)

Authorized by Norman Feister, President of Black Crystal Company, Inc. by cable dated to sign the above document.

We have read the above and foregoing assignment and consent to the terms thereof and agree to make payments due, or to become due, on account of said Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/U0 direct to The Black Crystal Company, Inc.

However it must be understood that no proceeds can be distributed or funded until they are received by our bank after the vessel is loaded and the required documentation is received by us. Also, any delay caused by sources beyond our control will not qualify for a liability on our part.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 19__.

United Kentucky Bank, Inc
(Bank)

s/Donald C. Reynolds
(Authorized Signatory)

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this 13th day of June, 1981.

APPENDIX D-5

ASSIGNMENT OF PROCEEDS

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That The Black Crystal Company, Inc. Assignor, A Corporation, existing under the laws of Kentucky, for value received does hereby assign, set over and transfer to Antares Shipping & Trading Company, Assignee at San Francisco, California all rights, title and interest to all monies due, or to become due, under Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/UO, issued by City Bank of Taipei, Taiwan dated 2/18/81 issued to The Black Crystal Company, Inc., for the account of Lucky Cement Corporation, Taipei,Taiwan, in the amount of One Million Seven Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Forty and 00/100 U.S.D., of which the balance of $1,058,880.00 remains.

That the amount being assigned herewith is the amount of each draft drawn under the aforementioned Credit up to the aggregate sum of $725,760.00. The Assignee shall not be held responsible for the performance of any work or for the manufacture or delivery of any of the items mentioned in the said Letter of Credit. The Assignor warrants that they have not and will not, by negotiation of drafts or other wise, assign the right to receive the whole or any part of such proceeds or give any other

authorization or direction to make any payment thereof to any third party.

s/Bryan Perry

(Assignor) Bryan Perry, Executive V.P.
Black Crystal Company, Inc.

By: _____
(Authorized Signatory and Title)
Authorized by Norman Feister, President
Black Crystal Company, Inc by cable dated
7/7/81 to sign the above allotment

We have read the above and foregoing assignment and consent to the terms thereof and agree to make payments due, or to become due, on account of said Documentary Credit No. OTH2/00790/UO direct to The Black Crystal Company, Inc.

However it must be understood that no proceeds can be distributed or funded until they are received by our bank after the vessel is loaded and the required documentation is received by us. Also, any delay caused by sources beyond our control will not qualify for a liability on our part.

Dated this 7th day of July, 1981.

United Kentucky Bank, Inc
(Bank)

s/Donald C. Reynolds
(Authorized Signatory)

APPENDIX E

RCA JUL 15 0617

FIRSTLOU LVL

11722 A TAIPEIBK

11722 TTK TO FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF LOUISVILLE

JULY 15

TEST: 27-686 ON USDLS 1,507,683.21

PLS RELAY FOLLOW MESSAGE TO UNITED KENTUCKY BANK LOUISVILLE

RE YOUR TELEX DATED JULY 13 1981 FOR USDLS $1,507,683.21

OUR L/C OTH2/00790/UO UNPAID DUE TO:

1) INVOICE VALUE SHOULD BE USDLS1,451,093.35 CALCULATED AS USDLS67.60 X 22,383.606 MT X (100PCT-4.1PCT)
2) CERT OF WEIGHT SHOULD BE ISSUED BY COMMERCIAL TESTING AND ENGINEERING CO.
3. SPECIFICATION OF SIZE NOT SPECIFY BY COMMERCIAL TESTING AND ENGINEERING CO AND MOISTURE UPON LOADING ON VESSEL 10.36PCT SPECIFIED BY BLACK CRYSTAL DIFFERS FROM THAT IN COMMERCIAL TESTING AND ENGINEERING CO.'S CERT.
4) CERT OF INSPECTION ANALYSIS NOT SPECIFIED THE BASIS OF MOISTURE
5) LATE SHIPMENT

IN RESPONSE OR REPLY TO THIS MATTER PLEASE SEND US WITH TESTED CABLE

TAIPEIBANKD.

FIRSTLOU LVL 11722 A TAIPEIBKMMMM